1			
1	TRINETTE G. KENT (State Bar No. 222020) 10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-192		
2	Phoenix, AZ 85028		
3	Telephone: (480) 247-9644		
4	Facsimile: (480) 717-4781 E-mail: tkent@lemberglaw.com		
5			
6	Of Counsel to		
7	Lemberg Law, LLC A Connecticut Law Firm		
8	1100 Summer Street Stamford, CT 06905 Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424		
9			
10			
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Robert Frese		
12			
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	EASTERN DIVISION		
16			
17	Robert Frese,	Case No.: 5:15-cv-1216	
18	Trooti Troot,	Cuse 110 0.10 07 1210	
19	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
20	vs.	FOR VIOLATIONS OF:	
21	WILL DINA	1. THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER	
22	Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,	PROTECTION ACT; 2. THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT	
23	Defendant.	COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT	
24		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
25			
26			
27			
28			

Plaintiff, Robert Frese (hereafter "Plaintiff"), by undersigned counsel, brings the following complaint against Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (hereafter "Defendant") and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* ("TCPA"), and repeated violations of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, *et seq.* ("Rosenthal Act").
- 2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3), Cal. Civ. Code 1788.30(f), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), where the acts and transactions giving rise to Plaintiff's action occurred in this district and/or where Defendant transacts business in this district.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing in Beaumont, California, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).
 - 5. Plaintiff is a "debtor" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h).
- 6. Defendant is a business entity located in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and is a "person" as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).

7. Defendant, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of itself or others, engages in the collection of consumer debts, and is a "debt collector" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

- 8. Plaintiff is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt asserted to be owed to Defendant.
- 9. Plaintiff's alleged obligation arises from a transaction in which property, services or money was acquired on credit primarily for personal, family or household purposes and is a "consumer debt" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).
- 10. At all times mentioned herein where Defendant communicated with any person via telephone, such communication was done via Defendant's agent, representative or employee.
- 11. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff utilized a cellular telephone service and was assigned the following telephone number: 909-XXX- 3105 (hereafter "Number").
- 12. Defendant placed calls to Plaintiff's Number in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 13. The aforementioned calls were placed using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS").

- 14. When Plaintiff answered the phone, he was met with a significant period of silence followed by a series of clicks at which point the call was transferred to an operator.
- 15. Plaintiff does not know how Defendant acquired his cellular phone number as he did not provide it to Defendant, and Plaintiff did not provide Defendant with consent to be contacted on his Number.
- 16. Moreover, on or around March 25, 2015, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant's representative and demanded that the automated calls cease.
 - 17. Nevertheless, the calls continued.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

- 18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 19. The TCPA prohibits Defendant from using, other than for emergency purposes, an ATDS and/or Robocalls when calling Plaintiff's Number absent Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 20. Defendant's telephone system has the earmark of using an ATDS in that Plaintiff, upon answering calls from Defendant, heard a significant period of silence followed by a series of clicks before being transferred to a live representative.

21. De	fendant called Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS without Plaintiff's	
consent in that I	Defendant either never had Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so o	
such consent was effectively revoked when Plaintiff requested that Defendant cease		
all further calls.		

- 22. Defendant continued to willfully call Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS knowing that it lacked the requisite consent to do so in violation of the TCPA.
- 23. Plaintiff was harmed and suffered damages as a result of Defendant's actions.
- 24. The TCPA creates a private right of action against persons who violate the Act. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).
- 25. As a result of each call made in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages.
- 26. As a result of each call made knowingly and/or willingly in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff may be entitled to an award of treble damages.

COUNT II

VIOLATIONS OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq.

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 28. The Rosenthal Act was passed to prohibit debt collectors from engaging in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.

- 29. Defendant caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously to annoy Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(d).
- 30. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant for:

- A. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each call determined to be in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C.§ 227(b)(3);
- B. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing under the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C.§ 227(b)(3);
- C. Actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);
- D. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for knowingly and willfully committing violations pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);
- E. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Cal. Civ.Code § 1788.30(c);
- F. Punitive damages; and
- G. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

DATED: June 22, 2015 TRINETTE G. KENT By: /s/ Trinette G. Kent Trinette G. Kent, Esq. Lemberg Law, LLC
Attorney for Plaintiff, Robert Frese